

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted preliminary to the issuance of an Office Action in the present application and in response to the Official Action of November 4, 2008.

Claims 25-48 are pending in the application. Claims 44-48 are withdrawn from consideration in response to a restriction requirement. Claims 25 and 39-41, and 44 have been amended. No amendment to the specification has been made.

Claims 25-27, 29-30, 32, 34-37, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al (US 5900687).

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al.

Claims 28, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. in view of Morreale (US 4039875).

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al in view of Takano et al. (US 6566779).

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. in view of Gulbrandson et al. (US 5717273).

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et.al. in view of Gulbrandson et al. (US 5717273) and further in view of Lin (US 6100614).

Record is also made of a telephone interview between applicant's representative and the Examiner which took place on February 26, 2009. The Examiner is thanked for his help and assistance as well as for the courtesies extended to Counsel at that time. During the course of the interview, the present application was extensively discussed on the basis of claim changes to claim 25 which were faxed to the Examiner beforehand. As a result of the interview, applicant now submits the amendments to claim 25, as proposed. Claims 39-41 have been amended to change their dependency as a result of the cancellation of claims 36-38 and to make them consistent with the changes to claim 25.

More specifically, applicant noted at the interview that claim 25, as now on file, recites an electric machine with a rotor, a stator having at least one winding system constructed of a plurality of coils, each coil having wiring strands with ends, and a circuit support disposed on an end face of the stator and formed as a printed circuit board. The printed circuit board has formed thereon channels with printed conductor tracks interconnecting the wiring strands in the channels in a predetermined wiring pattern and webs arranged between the conductor tracks for separating electrical potentials and lengthening leakage paths between different phases. The circuit support further includes snap-on connections engaging with the stator and securing the circuit support on the stator. A cover is provided which has webs meshing with corresponding webs of the circuit support and holding the wiring strands down in the channels and maintaining the leakage paths between the different phases.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or reasonably suggest the features recited in amended claim 25. For example, Kondo fails to disclose at least snap-in connections for attaching the circuit support to the stator, interconnecting the wiring strands in the channels, and a cover with webs that mesh with corresponding webs of the circuit support. These features are also not disclosed in the other documents of record.

Applicant submits that claim 25 as amended herein is therefore patentable.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 25, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has also amended non-elected independent method claim 44 to track the changes made to claim 25. Thus, claim 44 includes all the limitations of claim 25 so that rejoinder of withdrawn claims 44-48 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is considered patentably differentiated over the prior art of record and believed to be in immediate conditions for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are thus respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 31,084

Date: March 3, 2009  
708 Third Avenue  
Suite 1501  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
(212) 244-5500  
HMF/WS:af